

Texas that border Mexico, on any given day, about 35 percent to 40 percent of the people they have in their jails are foreign nationals charged with crimes in the United States. These are not immigration violations. These are crimes, some of them violent crimes—35 percent to 40 percent. So the crime is already pouring over because people can go back and forth across the U.S.-Mexican border at will because there are parts of the border that no one controls.

In fact, the situation is so bad this year that the Texas Department of Public Safety today has made a statement telling young people about spring break. And here is what they say: "Various crime problems exist in many popular resort areas of Mexico such as Acapulco and Cancun, and crimes against U.S. citizens often go unpunished."

"The safety message is simple: avoid traveling to Mexico during spring break and stay alive." So, we are even being warned not to let your kids go to Mexico during spring break because it is not safe.

So what do we do about this? Well, there was raids recently this week because of an ICE agent that was killed in Mexico. Raids were made in the United States, and 676 drug cartel members were arrested, \$12 million was seized, lots of drugs and lots of guns. And it's a point that we need to understand as citizens, that the drug cartels operate in Mexico, but they operate in the United States as well. They bring those drugs to other gang members throughout the cities of America, and they sell those wares here in the United States. So the crime does occur on both sides of the border. And we need to understand that.

It is important that we deal in reality and understand that the border is a war zone. A Texas Ranger once told me, he said, "Congressman POE, after dark on the Texas-Mexican border, it gets western." Those days need to end. We need to put the National Guard on the border and secure the border. It will protect the United States and Mexico. And that's just the way it is.

WE STAND WITH OHIO WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, today people from across Ohio are gathering at the Statehouse in Columbus. They are gathering to speak up for workers and the middle class in this country. Last Tuesday, I went to Columbus and joined our brothers and sisters in our fight to protect the right of public employees to have a voice at the negotiating table. And as we gathered to oppose Senate bill 5, that backward effort of Governor Kasich and his Republican friends in the State legislature to eliminate collective bargaining, I was struck by the weight of the moment and by the weight of this fight. But I

was inspired, too—inspired to see thousands of people from across the State coming together to protest the radical measures that the Republicans were proposing.

Though we can't be there today physically, we are there with those who gather at the Statehouse, and we stand with them from our place here in our Nation's capital. Last week, we were there shoulder to shoulder, people in common purpose, standing up for working families, standing together in the fight for the promise of the middle class.

The unfair, backward-thinking attack on Ohio's firefighters, police, teachers, nurses, and other dedicated public employees must be stopped. And I'm proud to be standing with Ohioans that are fair-minded as we fight for progress, not for a return to old ways. Instead of pursuing this draconian measure attacking Ohio's working families, lawmakers at every level of government should be focused on the critical priority of getting people back to work instead of engaging in attacks on those who have chosen to teach our children, protect our communities, and keep us safe.

Everyone should be working to strengthen our economy and create jobs. That, in turn, would generate the revenue we need to fairly compensate our public employees with the wages and the benefits which they have been promised and they have earned. The focus of all officials, as I said, across all levels of government, should be on creating jobs, not taking more from our workers. It was not our workers who drove the economy off the cliff. It was not our workers in Ohio. It was not the workers in Wisconsin. But it seems that the Republicans just can't stop themselves. Similar efforts to disempower working families and the middle class are occurring right here in Washington.

It is not just collective bargaining for public employees that they're after. Two weeks ago, Republicans tried to pass a measure in Congress to prohibit the paying of prevailing wages and to stop local project labor agreements, which would put a hard hit on our trades people. They even tried to eliminate the National Labor Relations Board, the very board that exists as a referee to make sure that our workers get a fair shake.

Yet they have not offered any job creation bills. And at the same time they are not creating jobs, they are defunding programs that have real benefits: their refusal to expand the trade adjustment assistance that helped workers who were displaced because of the trade policies that they pursued; the refusal of some to extend unemployment benefits to those who are out of a job through no fault of their own. At the same time they are working to not create jobs, they are also giving no assistance to those who are left without a job. It's issues like these that make it so important that we keep our heads up in Ohio.

And to all of those who are out there in Ohio and across the country fighting this fight, it's an important fight, and what you do matters. It's important that we speak up and be heard so that the issues that matter to us so very deeply are well sounded. We have to stand together and work together and fight forward.

Using the deficit as an excuse, there are those who are trying to convince the American people that a more fair economy would result in a much less efficient economy. But fairness and efficiency are not mutually exclusive. Using the deficit as an excuse to give a disproportionate hit to workers or unions is not the way to go.

I would hope that the Republicans, both at the State level as well as here in Congress, would join with us to focus on what we really need to do, and that is to create jobs. And I would hope that they would stop the misguided attack on workers and the middle class.

THE IMPERIAL PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to challenge this body, and I hope that my message is well received. This Nation was founded on the rules of the Constitution, not the opinions of Republicans and Democrats. Our decisions are judged in the light of the traditions of the past and the precedent that it sets for the future and the future generation.

Mr. Speaker, according to our Constitution, a President cannot pick and choose which parts of the law he prefers. The executive branch does not write the law nor choose the law. It enforces the law. The basic function of every President is to enforce the law. Every executive branch agency has its foundation in a short and clear statement from the Constitution stating this: He—that means the President—shall take care that the law be faithfully executed.

A President can petition for laws to be changed. He can complain about a law. He can encourage passage of new law. But he cannot just ignore the law or write new law. Only the courts can throw out a law, and only Congress can write a law. The President and the Department of Justice cannot unilaterally decide not to enforce the Defense of Marriage Act.

For decades, the Congress has been donating their constitutional powers to the executive branch by giving increased rulemaking authority to the different agencies. Our agencies now write rules that look more like legislation than regulation. We have allowed people to serve in "Cabinet lite" level positions without Senate approval. We have exponentially increased the budget for White House staff. And now the President wants to set a new precedent that he alone can determine which

laws he likes and he does not like. With this action, the President has invented a retroactive veto on all previous Presidents and all previous congressional acts.

It is ultimately ironic that the executive branch states that several lower courts have rejected the Defense of Marriage Act as unconstitutional, so they are accepting the lower court rulings over a higher court. In the past year, the health care law was ruled unconstitutional, but the Federal Government is pressing forward. The administration was instructed by the courts to lift the drilling moratorium in the gulf, but they stalled.

□ 1110

It is apparent that this administration is bent on placing its political preferences ahead of the courts, ahead of the legislative branch, and the majority of the American people.

Both parties need to understand the precedent that's being set by the President's choosing to not enforce the Defense of Marriage Act. My Democrat friends should imagine for a moment, what if when a Republican President takes the oath and he instructs HHS and all other agencies not to enforce ObamaCare, though it's the law of the land, because some lower court rejected it? They would be outraged, rightfully so, because currently it is the law of the land. A President cannot just unilaterally throw it aside.

Before this conversation is spun as a partisan issue, let me remind everyone, though, that the Defense of Marriage Act passed the House and the Senate by a wide bipartisan majority and was signed into law by a Democrat President. This is not only a slap in the face to our constitutional system; it is a slap to Republicans and Democrats who expressed the will of their districts and States on an issue that has been settled in law.

The people spoke through Congress, and one person, even a President, cannot undermine the will of the people. At least not in the America that I grew up in.

I do not think we will fully understand the implications of this action if we allow it to stand. We must not act partisan now and regret it later. This is not the way to deal with the gay marriage debate, for the President to just sweep it aside and say, "I will not enforce the law."

Many in this Chamber are well aware of my traditional view of marriage and my Biblical world view. I am unashamed of my personal faith in Jesus Christ. I believe that words have meaning, though, and that the meaning of marriage is the union of a man and a woman. The Defense of Marriage Act codified that definition in law, representing the belief of a majority of Americans.

This issue is well beyond faith, though, or a social issue or even a political issue. Marriage is now not only the center of a national debate, it's

now the center of a constitutional debate.

Weeks ago some members of the press suggested that Republicans would ignore the budget and focus on social issues. I find it ironic now that the President has submitted a budget that will raise the national debt to \$26 trillion, by his own numbers, and he has decided to change the national debate from fiscal issues to social issues and gay marriage.

As a Congress, we cannot demand of the executive branch, which is a co-equal branch of government. But I believe we must require the executive branch to fulfill its oath of office and constitutional requirement to faithfully execute the laws of the United States.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to attempts by the Republican Governor of Ohio to undermine collective bargaining for Ohio's public employees.

Ohio Senate bill 5 is a measure currently under consideration by the Ohio General Assembly that would strip State workers of collective bargaining rights. I firmly support the right of public employees to collectively negotiate. Who are we as a Nation when we tell our firefighters and our police officers and other public protectors that they should have no say in their working conditions? Does a teacher's experience or education have no economic value? Ohio's proposed legislation is less about fiscal responsibility than an overt political attack on public workers who speak with a collective voice.

As labor battles erupt in State capitals around the Nation, a majority of Americans say they oppose efforts to weaken the collective bargaining rights of public employee unions. According to the latest New York Times/CBS News poll, Americans are against cutting the pay or benefits of public workers to reduce State budget deficits.

We shouldn't forget, Mr. Speaker, the benefits that collective bargaining offers. For almost 28 years, collective bargaining has reduced labor strife, it has reduced the likelihood of strikes, improved training and productivity among public employees, created a sense of job security, and it is fair. It is fair to all working people.

The repeal of collective bargaining will do nothing to balance the budget. Nine percent of the State's budget is for State employees. So just as an example, if we fired every State employee in Ohio, it would save us only \$2 billion, leaving the State without vital services, and there would still be a \$6 billion deficit. Since this does not address the budget deficit, it is clear that anti-worker forces are using this to harm middle-income workers and to kill jobs.

I would like to share a observation with you that was from a former President of the United States, and I quote:

"Republicans stand foursquare for the American home—but not for housing. They are strong for labor—but they are stronger for restricting labor's rights. They favor minimum wage—the smaller the minimum wage, the better. They endorse educational opportunity for all—but they won't spend money for teachers or for schools. They think modern medical care and hospitals are fine—for people who can afford them. That is the philosophy of the masters of the Republican Party."

These are the words of President Harry Truman, and they were spoken in 1948. These words ring as true today as they did in 1948. We have made too many advances over the past generations, and Americans should not be forced to choose between a job and their rights.

We cannot and should not return to the days when public workers had limited rights to bargain. The middle class was created and has been sustained by collective bargaining and other labor protections. The public sector is about working families. Rolling back these rights will hurt the middle-income wage earners of this country and will hurt America.

Ohio needs jobs, not a partisan victory. I urge members of the Ohio General Assembly to deliberate with care and avoid rushing to adopt a measure that weakens our middle class, weakens our State, and costs us jobs.

HIGH-SPEED RAIL FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise today as the ranking member on the Transportation Subcommittee on Railroads. I have been on this committee for over 19 years. I serve on Transportation because it's one of the most bipartisan committees in the House.

I have got to tell you I am very, very disappointed with Florida Governor Rick Scott. Last week, the Governor told Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood that the State of Florida can do without the \$2.5 billion for Federal highway rail funding. That's \$2.5 billion, and 90 percent of the project is funded with Federal tax dollars. That's money that Floridians sent to Washington that we are sending back to Florida, gasoline tax money, not money from any foreign source, by the way.

In addition, it didn't just happen. We worked on it, bipartisan, for years. In fact, in 1980 Bob Graham appointed me to a committee to work on high-speed rail in Florida. Over 30 years we worked on it. And let me just tell you 90 percent of the funding would put over 60,000 Floridians to work. It's 90 percent of the funding. Is the other 10 percent there? Absolutely. The private